

Appl. No. 10/777,367
Amdt. dated Feb. 21, 2005
Reply to Office action of Dec. 2, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, see page 2 of the action, by failing to comply under 37 CFR 1.84(b)(4) as noted.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the drawings and all of the drawing objections the Examiner has set forth, as noted beginning on page 2 of the action and running through page 4 of the action and has complied with same and as submitted herewith replacement sheets as per the requirement.

Under the specification, the Examiner has objected to the disclosure for informalities; see item 5 beginning on page 5 of the action.

It is respectfully submitted that the specification has been corrected accordingly and that all informalities have been addressed as with the drawings in combination by either modifying the drawings or the specification to correspondingly comply with the corrections required.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 3-5 for informalities beginning on item 6, page 3 of the action.

Applicant has identified and corrected those informalities in relation to the above referred to amended claims which are directed to the allowable subject matter, see item 4 of the action, in which the Examiner indicated that claims 3-5 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim basis, but would be allowed if

rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Applicant has extensively amended the claims to effectively rewrite by claims 3-5 by introducing those limitations into amended claim 1 which is believed to meet the compliance of allowable subject matter statement.


As to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, specifically, claims 1, 2 and 6, applicant has by amending claims as noted above with the allowable subject matter introduces sufficient limitations to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 as set forth under item 8 and has canceled claims 3-5 by introducing those limitations into rewritten claim 1 as independent claim.

It is therefore believed that the claims as currently amended meet the requirement of allowable subject matter and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and that the specification has been amended to overcome the objections with same and the replacement sheets of drawings correspondingly address the issues set forth in the objection to the drawings the Examiner has indicated.

Accordingly, the claims as currently amended are believed in condition for allowance and the same is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Randall L. Best

By 
R.C. Harpman, Reg. No. 29,802

(330) 758-7505